



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,039	11/14/2005	Peter Heeley	64751	6620
27975 7590 05/02/2008 ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791				
EXAMINER WILLIAMS, MARK A				
ART UNIT 3673		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/02/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

creganoa@addmg.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,039

Applicant(s)

HEELEY ET AL.

Examiner

MARK A. WILLIAMS

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 16-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 16-22, 24, 25 and 27-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 23 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/17, 8/3/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not fully understood exactly what is meant by “with one part twisted with respect to the other...” in the context of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 16-22, 24, and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hensley et al., US Patent 5,657,653. A locking mechanism for a latch mechanism having a latch spindle 118 turnable to move a latch bolt from its

latching position (as conventional in the art), the locking mechanism comprising a rotatable handle 104 having a drive passageway (shafted end) therein for fitting to an adjacent end of the latch spindle; and a locking member 110 mounted on the handle; and a retainer 112 associated and engageable with the locking member to lock the handle against rotation; the drive passageway being configured to allow the handle to turn relatively to the latch spindle in opposite directions through a predetermined angle of movement, at one end of which, the handle is engageable with the latch spindle (via the change of connecting elements) for turning the latch spindle in an opening direction to move the latch bolt from its latching position and, at the opposite end of which, the handle is in a locking position in which the locking member is engageable with the retainer and the handle is engageable with the spindle to prohibit turning of the spindle in the opening direction. The locking member is slidably mounted in the handle to be selectively engageable with the retainer as claimed. The locking member has biased control device (108, 154) projecting and functioning as claimed. A guide (inner surface 134) defining an arc of movement for the locking member when the handle is turned in the opening direction from its rest position is inherent to the design. A spring device 126 is provided biasing the handle to a rest position corresponding to one end of the angle

of movement defined by the passage way; the guide includes a stop 142 engageable with the locking member as claimed. The handle includes a lever arm which, in the rest position is arranged to be substantially horizontal, and wherein the retainer is disposed along the arc of movement of the locking member above the stop defining the rest position and at a position spaced about 45° - 60° above the stop, whereby the lever arm is lifted to permit the locking member to engage with the retainer and lock the handle in its locking position. A base plate 160 securable to a door having at least part of the latch mechanism and mounting the retainer thereon; and wherein the handle is rotatably mounted in the base plate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hensley et al.

Regarding claim 25, Hensley does teach a single axial flute and rib, yet does not provide plural flutes and ribs. The examiner serves Official Notice that it is well known in the art to use such structure in handle components for translation of rotational movement. Such a form is considered an art recognized equivalent structure to that of Hensley and would function at least equally as well. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the device of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. Such a form is considered an art recognized equivalent structure and would function at least equally as well.

Regarding claim 27, although a second handle assembly is not shown, the examiner serves Official Notice that it is well known in the art to use such structure in handle designs for operation of a latch member from either side of a door. It would have been obvious to modify the design Hensley to include such structure for the purpose of providing means for operation of a latch member from either side of a door, as known in the art.

Regarding claim 28, as best understood, the claimed structure is provided by Hensley at 74 and 76.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 23 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims of record have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

This action is non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Engle can be reached on (571) 272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patricia L Engle/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 3673

/Mark Williams/
4/28/08

